United Nations A/C.5/54/SR.63

General Assembly
Fifty-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
11 July 2000

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 63rd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 11 May 2000, at 10 a.m.

Chairman Ms. Wensley ..... (Australia)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Mselle

Contents

Agenda item 150. Financing of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone

Agenda item 172: Financing of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone

Agenda item 121: Programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (*continued*)

Estimates in respect of matters of which the Security Council is seized

Resource requirements for the high-level international intergovernmental event on financing for development and the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/54/L.82

Other matters

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

00-42736 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 150: Financing of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (A/54/778 and A/54/858)

Agenda item 172: Financing of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (A/54/820 and A/54/858)

1. **Mr. Halbwachs** (Controller), introducing the reports of the Secretary-General on financing of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (A/54/778) and financing of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (A/54/820), said that the former contained the financial performance report of the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL) for the period from 13 July 1998 to 30 June 1999. The General Assembly had appropriated $22 million for the Mission; of that amount, $16.2 million had been assessed on Member States and only $12.9 million had been spent. The significant under-expenditure was attributable to the scaling back of operations as a consequence of the outbreak of hostilities in Freetown in mid-December 1998 and early January 1999, which had led to the evacuation of UNOMSIL to Conakry and the subsequent downsizing of the Mission.

2. The second of the reports before the Committee (A/54/820) contained the revised budget for the operation of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) for the period from 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000 and the proposed budget for the subsequent 12-month period. The revised budget figure was $265.8 million, an increase of $65.8 million over the appropriation initially approved by the General Assembly. The increase was necessitated by the decision of the Security Council, in its resolution 1289 (2000), to expand the military component of the Mission and revise its mandate. The proposed budget for the period from 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001 totalled $476.7 million. Given the recent events in Sierra Leone, the amount remained necessary in view of the urgent need to bring the Mission forces up to authorized strength and to replace lost vehicles and equipment.

3. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the report of the Advisory Committee on the financing of UNOMSIL and UNAMSIL (A/54/858), said that the Advisory Committee had accepted without change the proposals of the Secretary-General both for the period ending 30 June 2000 and for the period from 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2001. Events in Sierra Leone since the Advisory Committee's report had justified the decision to accept the estimates proposed by the Secretary-General, subject, of course, to the Committee's observations in the report.

4. **Mr. Medina** (Morocco), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the Group commended the efforts of UNAMSIL to find a solution to the conflict in Sierra Leone. The Group was deeply concerned about the hostage-taking and loss of life but hoped that the Member States committed to participating would not be discouraged from doing so and that the matter could be resolved in the spirit of existing agreements between the parties to enable UNAMSIL to attain full strength by July 2000 as envisaged. The Secretary-General could count on the full support and cooperation of the African Group in reaching a solution.

5. **Mr. Amolo** (Kenya), speaking on behalf of the States of the East African Community, supported the statement of Morocco. The Community countries believed strongly in the role of the United Nations in peacekeeping in Africa and were deeply concerned about the increasingly dangerous situation in Sierra Leone. The participating troops of Kenya, in particular, had suffered grave injuries. Clearly, the mandate of UNAMSIL was not adequate. The East African Community fully supported the proposals put forward by the summit meeting of the Economic Community of West African States on 9 May 2000, calling for a review of the UNAMSIL mandate, speedy deployment of the rest of the required forces, an increase in the size of the forces authorized and rapid provision of equipment and *matériel*. Recent events in Sierra Leone and the said experience in Angola should demonstrate to the international community the importance of equal treatment in the way peacekeeping operations were established and financed.

6. The East African Community commended the Department of Peacekeeping Operations for its sterling efforts to recoup the situation, urged the Security Council to procrastinate no longer in giving UNAMSIL what it needed to do the job, and hoped that the Committee's deliberations would clear the way for adequate financing to UNAMSIL.

7. **Mr. Hassan** (Nigeria) endorsed the statements by Morocco and Kenya. The losses in Sierra Leone had also borne heavily on Nigeria. His delegation looked for expeditious measures to be taken to alleviate the situation.

Agenda item 121: Programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (*continued*)

Estimates in respect of matters of which the Security Council is seized (A/C.5/54/53 and A/C.5/54/57)

8. **The Chairman** drew the Committee's attention to the reports of the Secretary-General on the proposed resource requirements relating to the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Office in Angola (A/C.5/54/53) and to the monitoring mechanism authorized by the Security Council in its resolution 1295 (2000) (A/C.5/54/57).

9. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), presenting the oral report of the Advisory Committee, recalled that by resolution 1268 (1999) the Security Council had authorized the establishment of the United Nations Office in Angola (UNOA) for an initial period of six months ending 15 April 2000 and that the General Assembly, in its resolution 54/250 had approved a provision for UNOA in the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 of $2,030,500 for the period from 1 January to 15 April 2000. Subsequently, by resolution 1294 (2000), the Security Council had extended the mandate of UNOA to 15 October 2000.

10. According to paragraph 5 of the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/54/53), the total cost of the extension of the mandate was estimated at $4,434,400, to be partly offset by savings of $588,100 from the appropriations for the prior mandate period. The Committee agreed with the resulting proposed charge of $3,846,300 against the provision of $90,387,200 for special political missions under section 3, Political affairs, of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001.

11. With regard to staff resources, the Advisory Committee noted that the Security Council, in paragraph 2 of resolution 1268 (1999), had decided that UNOA should consist of up to 30 substantive Professional staff. In that regard, the Committee would like to draw attention to the fact that it was the function of the General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, to establish the level of resources, including staff, for activities of the Organization.

12. Paragraph 6 of the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/54/53 indicated that 114 posts (73 current and 41 new posts) were being proposed. It had been clarified that the 41 additional posts were required because support from the United Nations Observer Mission in Angola (MONUA) and the United Nations Development Programme was no longer available. The Committee recommended that, in future, the basis for establishing additional posts should be made clear. The rate of the mission subsistence allowance for international staff was being calculated at $72 rather than $116 per day because accommodation was being provided free of charge, as explained in paragraph 4 of the annex to the report (A/C.5/54/53).

13. It would be recalled that the Security Council, by resolution 1237 (1999) had established an independent panel of experts to investigate violations of the measures imposed by the Council against União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) in resolutions 864 (1993), 1127 (1997) and 1173 (1998). Following the submission of the panel's report, the Security Council, in paragraph 3 of resolution 1295 (2000), had requested the Secretary-General to establish a monitoring mechanism composed of up to five experts for a period of six months from its effective entry into operation to collect information on alleged violations through investigation of relevant leads, including those initiated by the panel of experts, and visits to relevant countries.

14. The resource requirements for a monitoring mechanism comprising five experts for six months were estimated at $710,600 (A/C.5/54/57, para. 4). The Committee recommended that the General Assembly should approve a charge of $710,600 against the provision of $90,387,200 for special political missions under section 3, Political affairs, of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001.

15. Should the General Assembly approve both charges, the total charge against the provision for special political missions would amount to $66,074,600, leaving an uncommitted balance of $24,312,600.

16. **Ms. Buergo Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that her delegation supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee but felt that the General

Assembly should have a much more active role in considering issues related to the implementation and financing of activities mandated by the Security Council and funded through the regular budget. She hoped that the Fifth Committee would find time to consider that question. In the meantime, she would like to know what amount of the total under section 3 of the programme budget related to Security Council mandates.

17. **Mr. Odaga-Jalomayo** (Uganda) said that his delegation seconded the comments made by the Advisory Committee concerning the mandate of the Fifth Committee to make recommendations about level of resources, including staff. He hoped that the relevant bodies would take due note.

18. Since the lower subsistence allowance was based on the assumption that accommodation would be provided free of charge, he wondered whether there was sufficient accommodation to provide for the extra forces under the expanded mandate.

19. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the premises provided by the Government of Angola were at present only 25 per cent occupied. There should be room for the additional personnel authorized under the current mandate, so that the mission subsistence allowance could remain at the rate of $72. Should the mandate be further expanded, the question would, of course, come before the Committee again.

20. In response to the question by Cuba, of the total charge of $66,074,600 against the provision of $90,387,200 for special political missions under section 3 (Political affairs) of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001, $41,642,800 related to activities mandated by the General Assembly and the remaining $24,431,800 to activities mandated by the Security Council.

21. **The Chairman** suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the following draft decision:

"*The General Assembly*

"1. *Takes note* of the reports of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/54/53 and A/C.5/54/57 and the observations and recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the estimates in respect of matters of which the Security Council is seized;

"2. *Approves* the charge of total requirements of $4,556,900 for the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Office in Angola and the monitoring mechanism against the provisions for special political missions under section 3, Political affairs, of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001;

"3. *Notes* that following this decision, the utilization of the provisions for special political missions amounts to $66,074,600, and that an unallocated balance of $24,312,600 remains against the provision of $90,387,200 for special political missions."

22. **Mr. Orr** (Canada) asked the Secretariat to clarify the official title of the monitoring mechanism referred to in the draft decision.

23. **Mr. Acakpo-Satchivi** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the phrase "on violations of the measures contained in Security Council resolutions 864 (1993), 1127 (1997) and 1173 (1998)" would be inserted after the words "monitoring mechanism" in paragraph 2 of the draft decision.

24. **Mr. Odaga-Jalomayo** (Uganda) asked whether the statement made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee would be issued as an official document. If so, the Committee should state, in its decision, that it endorsed the observations and recommendations of the Advisory Committee, instead of merely taking note of them, and should add that it requested their implementation by the relevant bodies.

25. **Ms. Buergo Rodríguez** (Cuba) said, with respect to the status of the report of the Advisory Committee, that the current situation exemplified the problems that arose when the Advisory Committee presented its reports orally to the Fifth Committee. Although she understood that that procedure was sometimes necessitated by the speed with which the Advisory Committee's reports were required, she hoped that the report which the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had just presented orally would be issued in document form.

26. **The Chairman** said that the statement made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee would be circulated as an official document.

27. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) suggested that, instead of requesting the relevant bodies to implement the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should request the Secretary-General to draw the relevant observations of the Advisory Committee to the attention of the President of the Security Council.

28. **The Chairman** said she took it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision, incorporating the amendments proposed by the delegations of Canada and Uganda and by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

29. *It was so decided.*

Resource requirements for the high-level international intergovernmental event on financing for development and the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (A/54/7/Add.14; A/C.5/54/58)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/54/L.82 (A/54/7/Add.14; A/C.5/54/59)

30. **Mr. Mselle** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the Advisory Committee's report on the review of the resource requirements for the high-level international intergovernmental event on financing for development and the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (A/54/7/Add.14), said that paragraphs 2 to 7 of the report dealt with the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. The requirements for the preparatory activities and for the Conference itself were estimated at $1,164,500 and $500,500, respectively, to implement the decisions taken previously by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Second Committee and the Advisory Committee. The Secretary-General had reported that travel requirements for the participation of two government representatives from each least developed country in the first session of the Preparatory Committee would amount to $582,000 and that an amount of $113,000 was available from the Trust Fund for the Participation of Least Developed Countries in Intergovernmental Meetings (A/C.5/54/58, paras. 3 and 4). Paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report indicated how the Secretary-General intended to handle the balance of the requirement, which amounted to $469,000. In paragraph 5 of its report, the Advisory Committee expressed reservations about the procedure outlined by the Secretary-General. In paragraph 6, it expressed agreement with the Secretary-General's proposal to report to the General Assembly at its fifty-fifth session with respect to the requirements for the second session of the Preparatory Committee and for the Conference itself, which amounted to $1,083,000.

31. Paragraphs 8 to 16 of the Advisory Committee's report concerned requirements related to the high-level international intergovernmental event on financing for development. The Advisory Committee had held a lively debate on that topic. It had taken some exception to the proposed treatment of the additional requirements of $154,500 and had considered that that amount should be subject to the procedures for the use and operation of the contingency fund (para. 15). Lastly, paragraphs 10 to 12 contained a number of observations on the payment of travel expenses for members of the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee.

32. **Mr. Hassan** (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Secretary-General's proposal to finance from the regular budget the activities outlined in paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/54/L.82 was consistent with the letter and spirit of the resolution. The Group of 77 and China endorsed the recommendation contained in the final sentence of paragraph 15 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/54/7/Add.14). However, the proposal contained in paragraph 7 of document A/C.5/54/59 was not consistent with the requirements of General Assembly resolutions 41/213 and 42/211.

33. The Group of 77 and China concurred with the Secretary-General's proposal to use the balance of $113,000 available in the Trust Fund for the Participation of Least Developed Countries in Intergovernmental Meetings for the purposes approved in General Assembly resolution 54/235 (A/C.5/54/58, para. 4). They were deeply concerned, however, at the proposal to use savings on exchange rates achieved in respect of the regular budget appropriation for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) to finance the participation of two representatives of each least developed country in the first session of the Preparatory Committee, representing an amount of $469,000 (A/C.5/54/58, paras. 4 and 6). The proposal was a serious distortion of the budgetary process and was aimed mainly at

having UNCTAD absorb the cost. The required amount of $469,000 should be viewed as going beyond the level of resources appropriated to section 11A and should be subject to the procedures of the contingency fund. The Secretary-General should redouble his efforts to mobilize the extrabudgetary resources that were supposed to finance participation by the least developed countries and report on the outcome of his efforts at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The Bureau of the Preparatory Committee should be regularly informed of efforts being made to that end. In response to the provisions of paragraph 14 of General Assembly resolution 54/235, he invoked part VI of resolution 45/248 B affirming that the Fifth Committee was the Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters.

34. **Mr. Hamidullah** (Bangladesh), speaking as coordinator of the 48 least developed countries on the question of the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, expressed support for the statement made by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The least developed countries were dismayed that, only two months before the first session of the Preparatory Committee, the financing of their participation remained undecided, and that no voluntary contributions had been made during a review in March. The least developed countries had already begun preparations for the Conference, with United Nations support, and the presence of their representatives was necessary in order to reflect the real situation in those countries.

35. Referring to document A/C.5/54/58, he noted the Secretary-General's proposals for utilizing $113,000 from the Trust Fund and drawing on potential foreign exchange savings under section 11A of the budget but wondered to what extent the participation of the least developed countries' representatives could be financed from the contingency fund. His delegation agreed with the proposal to address the question of resources for the participation of representatives of the least developed countries in the second session of the Preparatory Committee at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly (A/C.5/54/58, para. 7). However, in view of the shortfall in extrabudgetary resources, it might be necessary for the Secretary-General to request fresh commitment authority for that purpose.

36. **Ms. Buergo Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that her delegation fully associated itself with the statement made on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. It attached particular importance to the meetings referred to in the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/54/58) and felt that the Fifth Committee should take a practical decision to ensure that all the necessary resources were made available to enable representatives of least developed countries to take part in those meetings.

37. She was deeply concerned about the proposals by the Secretary-General which departed from the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 41/213 and 42/211, especially in relation to the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. She asked how the Secretariat justified the recent tendency to depart from established procedures by postponing the financing of activities requiring additional regular budget resources and subsequently addressing those requirements in the context of the performance report and charging them against the contingency fund. It would be useful to know the current balance of the contingency fund. In that connection, she drew attention to the recommendation contained in paragraph 15 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/54/7/Add.14). Lastly, she was concerned about the observations contained in paragraph 10 of that report, since they seemed to call into question the decision taken by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group of the General Assembly on Financing for Development as to how the resources in question were to be provided. Paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/54/L.82 could in no case set a precedent for the use of regular budget resources for the purposes envisaged therein.

38. **Mr. Repasch** (United States of America) said that his delegation attached great importance to the conferences under consideration. With respect to the indication, in paragraph 3 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/54/7/Add.14), that a total of $582,000 would be required for the participation of representatives of least developed countries in the first session of the Preparatory Committee, he asked for clarification of the basis for budgeting that amount. The indication, in paragraph 5 of the report, that the Secretariat had not replied to the Advisory Committee's enquiries as to the possibilities for the use of the contingency fund was somewhat mysterious, as it could reflect either reticence on the part of the Secretariat or a lack of assertiveness on the part of the Advisory Committee.

Lastly, he asked which paragraphs of General Assembly resolutions 41/213 and 42/211 had formed the basis for the observations contained in paragraph 15 of the Advisory Committee's report.

39. **Mr. Orr** (Canada) said that his delegation also strongly supported the two international conferences. However, the documents under consideration provided very little information as to why no provision had been made in the budget previously for the costs of those conferences. The conferences and the budget for the biennium 2000-2001 had already been approved, yet it seemed that every time the Committee held a formal meeting, it received requests for more money.

40. He shared the views of the Advisory Committee and the delegations of Nigeria and Cuba on the $700,000 in savings on exchange rates (A/54/7/Add.14, para. 4). It was inappropriate to single out a specific currency gain, which might not last, in a given budget section. While he appreciated the Secretariat's efforts to find inventive ways to finance the high-level event, he felt that that method was too inventive.

41. With respect to the amount of $154,500 for the travel of members of the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee for the high-level event, and the indication contained in paragraph 16 of the Advisory Committee's report, he asked how often the provisions of General Assembly resolution 1798 (XVII) of 11 December 1962 had been waived. He also wondered whether the amount of $154,500 made provision for the travel of all members of the Bureau, since some members came from developed countries and did not require reimbursement of such costs.

42. **Mr. Sach** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the proposals for the payment of travel expenses for representatives of least developed countries to the Preparatory Committee meetings, the first of which would take place in July 2000, had arisen in the discussions of the Fifth and Second Committees on arrangements for the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. That had been one of the unresolved issues which had been deferred from the Fifth Committee's deliberations on the programme budget for 2000-2001 during the main part of the fifty-fourth session. Resources for that purpose had been included in the Secretary-General's initial budget proposal in relation to the Conference and had been augmented during the fifty-fourth session as a result of requirements arising from draft resolutions adopted by the Second Committee; the related statements of programme budget implications had been submitted to the Fifth Committee, but the latter had been unable to take a final decision on the funding of those additional requirements.

43. In paragraph 14 of its resolution 54/235, which it had adopted on the report of the Second Committee, the General Assembly had decided to defray the cost of the participation of two government representatives from each least developed country in the meetings of the Preparatory Committee and the Conference itself through the use of extrabudgetary resources, and, in the event that those resources proved to be insufficient, had requested the Secretary-General to consider all other options, including the use of unspent balances from the regular budget for the biennium 1996-1997 as an exceptional measure. At the first part of the resumed fifty-fourth session, the Fifth Committee had learned that the appeal made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) for contributions of extrabudgetary funds had been unsuccessful. Consequently, it had deferred the issue to the second part of the resumed session, which was its last opportunity to take action to meet the requirements of resolution 54/235, paragraph 14, prior to the first Preparatory Committee meeting in July.

44. The Secretariat had found that some $113,000 remained from previous conferences, as indicated in paragraph 3 of the Advisory Committee's report. Given the necessity of meeting the requirements of resolution 54/235, the Secretariat had looked carefully at the implementation of the current biennial budget to determine whether there was any flexibility within existing appropriations to accommodate the remaining $469,000. Exchange rates had been particularly favourable in the first five months of 2000, and the amount of savings projected had been based on the amounts actually saved from January to April 2000 and projected for May. While that procedure was unusual, it had been followed because the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to consider all options, because the first session of the Preparatory Committee was fast approaching and because some Member States had taken the position that there should be no additional regular budget appropriations for the financing of those travel costs. Nonetheless, he fully understood the concerns expressed about the need to

adhere to General Assembly resolution 41/213 and the Advisory Committee's recommendation that a more conservative approach should be taken.

45. General Assembly resolution 54/251, section VI, indicated that the balance of the contingency fund was $16,362,700. With respect to the last sentence of paragraph 5 of the Advisory Committee's report, the Secretariat had indicated, in oral hearings with the Advisory Committee, that there would be no need to draw upon the contingency fund in connection with travel expenses; however, it had not had time to comply with the Advisory Committee's request for a written reply. With respect to General Assembly resolution 1798 (XVII), most of the very rare instances in which waivers had been granted had concerned the payment of travel expenses in connection with the preparation and holding of major conferences. Usually, extrabudgetary funds were made available to support those waivers; the use of regular budget funds in that connection was even rarer and was granted only for the travel of representatives of least developed countries to the sessions of the General Assembly and for the travel of participants in the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council, since such travel was excepted from the restrictions laid down in resolution 1798 (XVII). In the case of meetings of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly, the provisions of that resolution were rarely waived.

46. **Ms. Buergo Rodríguez** (Cuba) expressed concern at the nature of the Secretariat's proposal, which represented a departure from current budgetary procedure. She wondered why no consideration had been given to drawing on the $16 million contingency fund within the regular budget, consistent with the practice established by the General Assembly. She also noted with concern that in recent General Assembly resolutions, conditionalities had been attached to making use of the contingency fund in similar cases.

47. **Mr. Abdalla** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) expressed support for the remarks made by the representative of Cuba. It was truly ironic that the needs of the least developed countries had been highlighted at all the recent major global conferences, and yet the Secretariat could not draw on a $16 million contingency fund to enable representatives of those countries to participate in preparations for their own conference. While his delegation appreciated the Secretariat's innovative approach to securing resources, reliance on foreign exchange gains seemed risky. The Organization should find ways and means of financing a very important conference for the least developed countries, just as it had found ways and means of financing other initiatives. Similarly, representatives of developing countries had actively promoted and worked for the convening of a high-level international intergovernmental event on financing for development; the $154,000 required for their travel to the sessions of its Preparatory Committee should be financed from the contingency fund.

Other matters

48. **The Chairman** said that the Secretary of the Committee had received from the representative of Portugal, acting on behalf of the European Union, a request for the distribution of existing documentation on the current methodology of the peacekeeping scale of assessments, including document A/C.5/52/38 and General Assembly resolution 53/211. Upon consultation with the Legal Office, she had been informed that it was entirely appropriate to circulate those documents.

49. **Ms. Buergo Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that her delegation appreciated the clarification, since it had questioned the basis for distributing the documents, which did not fall under any agenda item before the Committee and dealt with a sensitive issue. Moreover, the Bureau had not participated in the decision to distribute them.

50. **Mr. Nakkari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, in view of the sensitivity of the matter, it was inappropriate to distribute documents bearing the symbol of the United Nations without indicating that they had been requested by the European Union. It was not the first time that such distribution, which gave the impression that the decision had been taken by the Bureau and the Fifth Committee, had taken place. It was to be hoped that greater discretion would be used in future.

51. **Mr. Yussuf** (United Republic of Tanzania) expressed concern at the manner in which information had been imposed on the Committee — information which it had not requested and did not need. In all his years at the United Nations, he had never witnessed a similar action, which was unethical and could be viewed as an attempt to initiate discussion of the issue prematurely.

The meeting rose at noon.